

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 1-19 are respectfully requested. Applicants have attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated July 26, 2005 (Paper No. 07182005) and believe the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

New claims 20-25 have been added to further clarify the present invention and to further distinguish the present invention from the cited references. No new matter has been added to the application.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted by Applicants' attorney on June 5, 2003.

The Specification stands objected to because of minor informalities. Specifically, on page 8, block 74 is mistakenly referred to as the predefined time period. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the term to read block 72. Further, Applicants have amended all of the trademarks in the application so they appear in capitalized letters, as required by the Examiner. Finally, on page 12, line 7, the Examiner noted that the "is" before "has" should be deleted. Applicants have accordingly deleted the "is." Applicants have also amended the Specification to correct grammatical and typographical errors. Therefore, Applicants submit that as amended, the Specification is now in proper form.

Claims 3-6, 10, 12 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the claim 3 recitation “the network card” lacks antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the feature to recite “a network card.” With respect to claim 4, the Examiner contends that it is unclear to which step of obtaining an address is being referred. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 4 to recite, among other things, “obtaining an address for the interface.” In claim 12, the term “the network card” lacks antecedent basis. Applicants have amended the feature to recite “a network card.” Also in claim 12, Applicants have amended lines 13-14 to recite “changing the obtained address of the interface to an address for obtaining the number of bytes transmitted,” and submit that as amended, claim 12 is clear. With respect to claims 14-17 and 15-17 the Examiner states that use of the terms “a Microsoft Windows operating system” and “Windows NT” renders the claims indefinite because there are several versions of the operating systems. Accordingly, Applicants have canceled claims 14-17.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner contends that claim 19 as recited is directed to software code stored on a computer readable medium, which is non-functional descriptive material and therefore non-statutory. Accordingly, Applicants have canceled claim 19 and therefore submit that the rejection is moot.

Claims 1, 3, 8-11 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Killian (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,671). Killian discloses a means for connecting to a network and increasing the communication between computers utilizing the network. Killian provides a program for determining whether a computer's dial-up physical interfaces are connected to the network. If they are not, and the traffic level in the network has reached a certain level, the program creates a connection based on a corresponding network layer address. (Col. 21, ll. 46-64; Fig. 20). Killian further provides a means for determining whether a computer is active/inactive on the network as a means for preventing messages from traveling to inactive interfaces. (Col. 22, ll. 30-42).

In contrast, amended claim 1 now recites, among other things, "deactivating the computer from the insecure network when it is determined that the computer is inactive, thereby securing the computer; activating the computer to the network when it is determined that the computer is active; and waiting for a predefined time period to repeat said method from said step of determining whether the computer is active." Applicants submit that as amended, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Killian. Specifically, Killian discloses a means for network connection and the distribution of messages to increase communication among users of the network. Killian only turns on or connects the network interfaces to the network when traffic within the network reaches a certain level. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 8-11 and submit that they are in allowable form.

Similarly, claim 18 has been amended to recite, among other things, “means for deactivating the computer from the insecure network when it is determined that the computer is inactive, thereby securing the computer; means for activating the computer to the network when it is determined that the computer is active; and means for waiting for a predefined time period to repeat the above method from the step of determining whether said computer is active.” As stated above with respect to amended claim 1, Applicants submit that as amended, claim 18 is patentably distinct from Killian. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With respect to claim 19, Applicants submit that the § 102(b) rejection of claim 19 is moot because claim 19 has been cancelled.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Killian in view of Dev et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,295,244). The arguments stated above traversing Killian are reasserted here. Dev was cited for disclosing the function of displaying the status of network connections to the user. Applicants submit that neither Killian nor Dev, either alone or in combination, suggest or disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1, from which claim 2 depends.

Applicants further submit that there is no incentive or suggestion to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants submit that modifying Killian to show the status of network connections to the user would not further the purpose of Killian, which is to provide increased bandwidth and

communication to its users. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4-7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Killian. The arguments stated above traversing Killian are reasserted here. Applicants submit that Killian fails to suggest or disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1, from which claims 4-7 and 12 either directly or indirectly depend. Specifically, Killian fails to disclose or suggest a method where a network interface remains connected to the network if the computer is active, and where the network interface is deactivated or turned off when the computer is not utilizing the network, thereby securing the computer and disabling all communication between the computer and the network. Rather, Killian provides an increased bandwidth or level of communication for its users by turning on or connecting network interfaces to the network when traffic within the network reaches a certain level. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103(a) rejection based on Killian.

Finally, claims 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Killian in view of Hayton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,799,209). The arguments stated above traversing Killian are restated here. Hayton was cited for disclosing whether a screensaver is activated on the computer. Applicants submit that because claims 14-17 have been cancelled the rejection against those claims is moot. Applicants further submit that neither Killian nor Hayton, either alone or in

Serial No.: 10/055,767  
Filed: January 23, 2002

combination, suggest or disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1, from which claim 13 depends.

Further, there is no incentive or suggestion to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. The goal of increasing bandwidth and communication among the users of the network in Killian would not be furthered by adding a means for activating a screensaver on a computer in the network utilized by Killian. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above amendments, the application is respectfully submitted to be in allowable form. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
Rebecca L. Uryga  
Registration No. 53,713

**Customer No. 24978**

November 28, 2005  
Suite 2500  
300 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315